

Remarks/Arguments

The Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 USC §112 for failure to particularly point out and distinct claim the subject matter that Applicants regards as their invention. Particularly, for reciting the limitation “said compressive force,” which lacks antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Applicants have amended Claim 5 to recite “a compressive force.” This amendment removes the condition that motivated the Examiner’s rejection and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claim 5 be passed to allowance.

The Rejections of Claims 1-20 under 35 USC §102(b)

In the Office Action of January 10, 2006 the Examiner rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,434 (“Casebolt”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

Claim 1

Casebolt does not teach a spring engaged with a cam and a knurl bar

Amended Claim 1 recites: “a first spring engaged with said first cam and said knurl bar.” Casebolt does not explicitly or implicitly teach a spring engaged with both a cam and a knurl bar. Instead, Casebolt teaches a spring engaging only a cam, as shown in Figure 1 of Casebolt. Specifically, spring 160 engages “cam” 158, but spring 160 does not touch knurl bar 140. An enlarged view of the most pertinent part of Figure 1 from Casebolt is shown below and illustrates this point. In particular, a region highlighted with a red dotted ellipse shows that the spring does not engage the knurl bar. In fact, it is clear that the spring cannot engage the knurl bar.




Figure 1

For all of the above reasons, Claim 1 is novel with respect to Casebolt. Claims 2-10, dependent from Claim 1, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Casebolt. Applicants courteously request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11

Casebolt does not teach a cam mounted on the mounting structure

Claim 11 recites: “a housing with a first *integral* mounting structure and a *first cam pivotally mounted on said first mounting structure*,...” (emphasis added). Casebolt fails to teach the preceding elements of Claim 11. Instead, in Figure 1 of Casebolt, cams 158 and 159 are shown associated with intermediate plate 130 (called a mounting structure by the Examiner), but cams 158 and 159 are not mounted on plate 130. Cams 158 and 159 float in between outer plates 111 (first structure) and 112 (second structure). The cams are not mounted on the mounting structure.

Rivets 122 extend through holes on cams 158 and 159, but rivets 122 are not integral to any of the structures of Casebolt. See Figure 1 and paragraph [0014]. The cams are not mounted to a mounting structure that is integral to the housing.

Casebolt does not teach a cam rotating about an integral mounting structure

Claim 11 recites: “said first cam operatively arranged to *rotate about* said first mounting structure.” (emphasis added). For a first object to rotate about a second point or object, the second object must form an axis within the first object. For example, in the present invention, mounting structure 38 is disposed within an opening in cam 15, forming an axis in cam 15, about which cam 15 rotates. In contrast, Casebolt teaches that cams 158 and 159 are mounted on rivets 122 (which are not integral to a housing) between outer plates 111 and 112 and that the receiving portions of the cams move away from tab 132. The cams rotate about the rivets and do not rotate about the intermediate plate 130 (dubbed the mounting structure by the Examiner).

Casebolt fails to teach all the elements of Claim 11. Therefore, Claim 11 is novel with respect to Casebolt. Claims 12-19, dependent from Claim 11, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Casebolt. Applicants courteously request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20


Claim 20 recites limitations similar to those recited in Claims 1 and 11. Applicants have shown that Claims 1 and 11 are novel with respect to Casebolt. Therefore, Claim 20 also is novel with respect to Casebolt. Applicants courteously request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Attorney Docket No. GTAP:102US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/711,289
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2006
Date: March 10, 2006

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney of record if such contact will facilitate an efficient examination and allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Paul Maliszewski
Registration No. 51,990
Simpson & Simpson PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221
Phone: (716) 626-1564
Fax: (716) 626-0366

TGM/CPM
Dated: March 10, 2006